1					
2					
3					
4					
5					
6					
7 8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE				
9	SAMUEL HELLER, an individual,	No. 2:19-cv-02021 RSM			
10	Plaintiff,	AGREEMENT REGARDING			
11	v.	DISCOVERY OF ELECTRONICALLY STORED INFORMATION AND ORDER			
12	ELASTICSEARCH, INC., a Delaware Corporation,	ORDER			
13	Defendant.				
14	Defendant.				
15	The parties hereby stipulate to the foll	owing provisions regarding the discovery of			
16	electronically stored information ("ESI") in this matter:				
17	A. General Principles				
18	1. An attorney's zealous representation of a client is not compromised by conducting				
19	discovery in a cooperative manner. The failure of counsel or the parties to litigation to cooperate				
20	in facilitating and reasonably limiting discovery requests and responses raises litigation costs and				
21	contributes to the risk of sanctions.				
22	2. As provided in LCR 26(f), the	proportionality standard set forth in Fed. R. Civ. P.			
23	26(b)(1) must be applied in each case when formulating a discovery plan. To further the				
24	application of the proportionality standard in discovery, requests for production of ESI and related				
25	responses should be reasonably targeted, clear	r, and as specific as possible.			

## B. ESI Disclosures

1

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

20

21

22

23

- Within 30 days of entry of this Order, or at a later time if agreed to by the parties, each party shall disclose:
- 1. <u>Custodians.</u> The five custodians most likely to have discoverable ESI in their possession, custody, or control. The custodians shall be identified by name, title, connection to the instant litigation, and the type of the information under the custodian's control.
- 7 2. <u>Non-custodial Data Sources.</u> A list of non-custodial data sources (*e.g.*, shared drives, servers), if any, likely to contain discoverable ESI.
  - 3. <u>Third-Party Data Sources.</u> A list of third-party data sources, if any, likely to contain discoverable ESI (*e.g.*, third-party email providers, mobile device providers, cloud storage) and, for each such source, the extent to which a party is (or is not) able to preserve information stored in the third-party data source.
  - 4. <u>Inaccessible Data.</u> A list of data sources, if any, likely to contain discoverable ESI (by type, date, custodian, electronic system or other criteria sufficient to specifically identify the data source) that a party asserts is not reasonably accessible under Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(2)(B).

## C. ESI Discovery Procedures

- - 2. <u>Search methodology.</u> The parties shall timely confer to attempt to reach agreement on appropriate search terms and queries, file type and date restrictions, data sources (including custodians), and other appropriate computer- or technology-aided methodologies, before any such effort is undertaken. The parties shall continue to cooperate in revising the appropriateness of the search methodology.

25

24

	D .	•	1
a.	Prior to	running	searches:

i.	The produci	ng party shall disc	lose the data sour	rces (including
custodians), search ter	rms and queries,	any file type and	date restrictions,	and any other
methodology that it pro	poses to use to loc	ate ESI likely to con	ntain responsive ar	nd discoverable
information. The parties	s shall meet and cor	afer to attempt to rea	ch an agreement or	n the producing
party's search terms an	nd/or other method	ology. The produci	ng party may prov	vide unique hit
counts for each search q	query.			

ii. If they reasonably believe that the search terms have not resulted in the discovery and production of responsive information, the requesting party is entitled to, within 14 days of the producing party's disclosure, add additional search terms or queries to those disclosed by the producing party, subject to the meet and confer requirements set forth herein.

iii. The following provisions apply to search terms / queries of the requesting party. Focused terms and queries should be employed; broad terms or queries, such as product and company names, generally should be avoided. A conjunctive combination of multiple words or phrases (e.g., "computer" and "system") narrows the search and shall count as a single search term. A disjunctive combination of multiple words or phrases (e.g., "computer" or "system") broadens the search, and thus each word or phrase shall count as a separate search term unless they are variants of the same word. The producing party may identify each search term or query returning overbroad results and a counter proposal correcting the overbroad search or query. Absent a showing of good cause, a search that returns more than 250 megabytes of data, excluding Microsoft PowerPoint files, audio files, and similarly large file types, is presumed to be overbroad. The producing party shall search both non-custodial data sources and ESI maintained by the custodians identified above.

b. After production: Within 21 days of the producing party notifying the receiving party that it has substantially completed the production of documents responsive to a

- request, the responding party may request additional search terms or queries. The immediately preceding section (Section C(2)(a)(iii)) applies.
- Upon reasonable request, a party shall disclose information relating to network design, the types of databases, database dictionaries, the access control list and security access logs and rights of individuals to access the system and specific files and applications, the ESI document retention policy, organizational chart for information systems personnel, or the backup and systems recovery routines, including, but not limited to, tape rotation and

## 3. Format.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

destruction/overwrite policy.

- a. The parties agree that ESI will be produced to the requesting party with searchable text, in a format to be decided between the parties. Acceptable formats include, but are not limited to, native files, multi-page TIFFs (with a companion OCR or extracted text file), single-page TIFFs (only with load files for e-discovery software that includes metadata fields identifying natural document breaks and also includes companion OCR and/or extracted text files), and searchable PDF.
- b. Unless otherwise agreed to by the parties, files that are not easily converted to image format, such as spreadsheet, database, and drawing files, will be produced in native format. A party desiring production in a particular format must specify the format sought in the request.
- c. Each document image file shall be named with a unique number (Bates Number). File names should not be more than twenty characters long or contain spaces. When a text-searchable image file is produced, the producing party must preserve the integrity of the underlying ESI, *i.e.*, the original formatting, the metadata (as noted below) and, where applicable, the revision history.
- d. If a document is more than one page, the unitization of the document and any attachments and/or affixed notes shall be maintained as they existed in the original document.

- 1 4. <u>De-duplication.</u> The parties may de-duplicate their ESI production across custodial and non-custodial data sources after disclosure to the requesting party.
  - 5. <u>Email Threading.</u> The parties may use analytics technology to identify email threads and need only produce the unique most inclusive copy and related family members and may exclude lesser inclusive copies. Upon reasonable request, the producing party will produce a less inclusive copy.
  - 6. <u>Metadata fields.</u> If the requesting party seeks metadata, the parties agree that the following metadata fields need to be produced,: document type; custodian and duplicate custodians (or storage location if no custodian); author/from; recipient/to, cc and bcc; title/subject; email subject; file name; file size; file extension; original file path; date and time created, sent, modified and/or received; and hash value. The list of metadata type is intended to be flexible and may be changed by agreement of the parties, particularly in light of advances and changes in technology, vendor, and business practices.

## D. Preservation of ESI

- The parties acknowledge that they have a common law obligation, as expressed in Fed. R.
- 16 Civ. P. 37(e), to take reasonable and proportional steps to preserve discoverable information in
- the party's possession, custody, or control. With respect to preservation of ESI, the parties agree
- 18 as follows:

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

- 19 1. Absent a showing of good cause by the requesting party, the parties shall not be
- 20 required to modify the procedures used by them in the ordinary course of business to back-up and
- 21 archive data; provided, however, that the parties shall preserve all discoverable ESI in their
- 22 possession, custody, or control.
- 23 2. The parties will supplement their disclosures in accordance with Fed. R. Civ. P.
- 24 26(e) with discoverable ESI responsive to a particular discovery request or mandatory disclosure
- 25 where that data is created after a disclosure or response is made (unless excluded under Sections
- 26 (D)(3) or (E)(1)-(2)).

1	3.	Abse	nt a showing of good cause by the requesting party, the following categories
2	of ESI need not be preserved:		
3		a.	Random access memory (RAM), temporary files, or other ephemeral data
4			that are difficult to preserve without disabling the operating system.
5		b.	On-line access data such as temporary internet files, history, cache,
6			cookies, and the like.
7		c.	Back-up data that are duplicative of data that are more accessible
8			elsewhere.
9		d.	Server, system or network logs.
10		e.	Any other categories the parties identify and mutually agree upon as the
11			case progresses.
12	E. Priv	ilege	
13	A pı	oducing	party shall create a privilege log of all documents fully withheld from
14	production of	on the ba	sis of a privilege or protection, unless otherwise agreed or excepted by this
15	Agreement	and Orc	ler. Privilege logs shall include a unique identification number for each
16	document and the basis for the claim (attorney-client privileged or work-product protection). For		
17	ESI, the privilege log may be generated using available metadata, including author/recipient of		
18	to/from/cc/bcc names; the subject matter or title; and date created. Should the available metadate		
19	provide insu	ıfficient	information for the purpose of evaluating the privilege claim asserted, the

23 2. Redactions need not be logged so long as the basis for the redaction is clear on the redacted document.

delivering a production unless a different deadline is agreed to by the parties.

producing party shall include such additional information as required by the Federal Rules of

Civil Procedure. Privilege logs will be produced to all other parties no later than 30 days after

3. With respect to privileged or work-product information generated after the filing of the complaint, parties are not required to include any such information in privilege logs.

20

21

22

25

1	4.	Activities undertaken in	compliance with the duty to preserve information are
2	protected fro	m disclosure and discovery	under Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(3)(A) and (B).
3	5.	Pursuant to Fed. R. Evi	d. 502(d), the production of any documents in this
4	proceeding s	hall not, for the purposes of	this proceeding or any other federal or state proceeding,
5	constitute a	waiver by the producing p	earty of any privilege applicable to those documents,
6	including the attorney-client privilege, attorney work-product protection, or any other privilege		
7	or protection recognized by law. Information produced in discovery that is protected as privileged		
8	or work product shall be immediately returned to the producing party, and its production shall not		
9	constitute a v	waiver of such protection.	
10	DATED: Feb	oruary 27, 2020	ARETE LAW GROUP
11			s/ Jonah O. Harrison (via email
12			<u>authorization)</u> Jonah O. Harrison, WSBA 34576
13			Denise Ashbaugh, WSBA 28512 1218 Third Avenue, Suite 2100
14			Seattle, WA 98101
15			Telephone: (206) 428-3253 Email: jharrison@aretelaw.com
16			Email: dashbaugh@aretelaw.com
17			Attorneys for Plaintiff
18	DATED: Feb	bruary 27, 2020	STOEL RIVES LLP
19			s/ Karin D. Jones
20			James M. Shore, WSBA No. Karin D. Jones, WSBA No. 42406
21			600 University Street, Suite 3600 Seattle, WA 98101
22			Telephone: 206.624.0900 Email: jim.shore@stoel.com
23			karin.jones@stoel.com
24			Attorneys for Defendant
25			

1	ORDER
2	
3	
4	Based on the foregoing, IT IS SO ORDERED.
5	DATED this 28th day of February 2020.
6	
7	
8	RICARDO S. MARTINEZ
9	CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	